



Public Schools of North Carolina  
State Board of Education  
Department of Public Instruction

# Exceptional Children Division Program Compliance Review 2015-2016

LEA Name

LEA Number

Dates of Visit:

Monitoring Consultant:

Date of Report:

## Table of Contents

Table of Contents .....	2
Monitoring Authority .....	3
Alignment to State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR).....	3
Alignment to the EC Division Strategic Plan .....	3
Alignment to the LEA Self-Assessment/Practice Profile .....	4
Purpose of the Visit.....	4
Monitoring Team .....	4
Methodology: Program Compliance Review.....	4
Student Monitoring Sample and Profile.....	6
Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Sample.....	7
Student Record Review.....	7
Interviews.....	7
Service Verification .....	7
Related Services Verification .....	8
LEA Resources .....	8
Licensure.....	9
Summary .....	10
Commendations .....	10
Recommendations.....	10
Procedural Violations.....	10
Compliance Status .....	10
Corrective Action Timelines.....	10
Resources .....	10

## Monitoring Authority

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEA), (20 U.S.C. 1400 (c)(1)), provides federal funds to assist states in educating children with disabilities and requires each participating state to ensure that school districts and other publicly-funded educational agencies in the state comply with the requirements of IDEA and its implementing regulations. Further, Section 616 of IDEA states that the primary focus of federal and state monitoring activities shall be on improving education results and functional outcomes for all children with disabilities and ensuring that states meet the program requirements with a particular emphasis on those requirements that are most closely related to improving educational results for children with disabilities. Article 9 of Chapter 115C of the North Carolina General Statutes requires local school districts to provide appropriate special education and related services and requires the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) to establish, monitor, and enforce regulations governing special education programs in the North Carolina public schools and all institutions wholly or partly supported by the state. The Exceptional Children Division of the NCDPI supervises and conducts the general supervision process in furtherance of the state's obligations under IDEA and Article 9.

## Alignment to State Performance Plan/Annual Performance Report (SPP/APR)

The Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) has implemented an accountability framework designed to more directly support States in improving the results for infants, toddlers, children and youth with disabilities, and their families. Section 616(a)(2) of the IDEA requires that the primary focus of IDEA monitoring be on improving educational results and functional outcomes for children with disabilities, and ensuring that States meet the IDEA program requirements.

Therefore, data for the *Part B Compliance Indicators* collected through this monitoring activity includes:

- Indicator 13: Secondary Transition

Additionally, the data collected through this monitoring activity provides information for use with:

- Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan (SSIP)

## Alignment to the EC Division Strategic Plan

Strategy A: Provide customized support for LEAs

- Objective A-1: Ensure every LEA has tools to measure fidelity of intervention and effectiveness of services
- Objective A-2: Ensure every LEA collects, analyzes, and utilizes valid and reliable data, including data profile, to make informed decisions.

Strategy D: Implement an effective general supervision system

- Objective D-4: Implement monitoring activities to ensure compliance with State and Federal Statutes and Regulations

## Alignment to the LEA Self-Assessment/Practice Profile

### Core Element 1: Policy Compliance and Monitoring

- The LEA provides training on the legal requirements of IDEA, Article 9 and NC Policies Governing Children with Disabilities.
- The LEA has an effective system for internal monitoring and general supervision, to include IEP implementation.
- LEA uses effective methods and practices for resolving complaints/disputes (formal and informal) within required timelines.

\*Aligns with Indicator 17: State Systemic Improvement Plan

## Purpose of the Visit

The Program Compliance Review is a comprehensive monitoring activity used to ensure that students with disabilities are provided a free appropriate public education. This activity occurs every five years for all local education agencies (LEAs) which includes traditional school systems, charter schools and state operated programs. Additionally, the Program Compliance Review is utilized in the second semester of the first year of operation for all new charter schools.

## Monitoring Team

The Monitoring Team is composed of consultants from the North Carolina Department of Exceptional Children Division (NCDPI ECD) and is led by the assigned regional monitor. The following team members participated in the on-site visit.

Name	Position
Monitors Name	NC DPI: ECD Monitoring Consultant

## Methodology: Program Compliance Review

The core components of the Program Compliance Review are:

- Student Record Review;
- Interviews regarding EC Process;
- Student Service Verification;
- Related Service Verification;

- LEA Resources; and
- Licensure.

The number of student records selected was based on the sampling chart below with additional records selected for monitoring transition elements. These student records become the “*Student Monitoring Sample*” utilized for each of the core components for this monitoring activity.

A description and rating scale for the core elements can be found within each section of the report. The data collection period for the core elements of related services verification and student outcomes is the completed grading period just prior to the monitoring visit.

Number of LEAs with Active Child Count	Student Monitoring Sample			**Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Sample
	Active Child Count	Number of Records	*Number of Schools	
142	Up to 100	5	3	Up to 10
24	101-250	7	3	10
26	251-500	10	3	15
23	501-1000	15	3	20
27	1001-2000	20	6	25
13	2001-3500	25	6	30
7	3501-5000	30	6	35
1	5001-6500	35	6	40
2	6501-8000	40	9	45
0	8001-10,000	45	9	50
3	>10,000	50	9	55

\*Number of Schools: *The number of records was equitably distributed between elementary, middle and high school grade levels. For Charter Schools or State Operated Programs, the number of records in the Student Monitoring Sample was distributed equitably across grade spans to the extent appropriate for the LEA.*

\*\*Number of Records for Indicator 13: *The number of records selected for monitoring secondary transition includes records from the Student Monitoring Sample. The additional records are pulled to provide a representative sample from across the school system.*

A summary of each core component is provided. The report concludes with notification of commendations; recommendations; procedural violations (if any); compliance standing; corrective action and associated timelines and resources to support the LEA in ensuring meaningful outcomes for students with disabilities.

## Student Monitoring Sample and Profile

The student monitoring sample was collected from the following schools:

Elementary School(s):

Middle School(s):

High School(s):

The Student Profile was developed by reviewing the attendance, discipline, grades, and achievement levels from state-mandated assessments for the Student Monitoring Sample. The rubrics below indicate the criteria for the rating of each area. The data selection period correlates with the last grading period prior to the on-site monitoring visit for attendance, discipline, and grades. The achievement levels are reported from the last state assessment in which the student participated. PowerSchool was utilized as the authoritative source for these data.

*\*These data are meant to be a snapshot of the student profile for a particular point in time.*

Attendance	
Good	0-3 absences
Fair	4-10 absences
Poor	10+ absences

Discipline: OSS Days	
Good	0-2 days
Fair	3-5 days
Poor	5+ days

Grades	
Good	All grades: <b>C</b> or above
Fair	1-2 grades: <b>D</b>
Poor	1+ grades: <b>F</b>

State Tests Reported
<b>EOC: English I</b>
<b>EOC: Math I</b>
<b>EOG: ELA/Reading</b>
<b>EOG: Math</b>
<b>NCEXTENDI: English I</b>
<b>NCEXTENDI: Math I</b>
<b>NCEXTENDI: ELA/Reading</b>
<b>NCEXTENDI: Math</b>

Achievement Levels (AL)	
<b>Level 5</b>	Superior Command
<b>Level 4</b>	Solid Command
<b>Level 3</b>	Sufficient Command
<b>Level 2</b>	Partial Command
<b>Level 1</b>	Limited Command

Unique ID	Grade	Disability	Attendance	Discipline	Grades	State Test	AL
	4	AU	Good	Fair	Fair	EOG: ELA/Reading	2

## Indicator 13: Secondary Transition Sample

The sample was collected from the following high schools:

Unique ID	Grade	Disability
	11	AU

## Student Record Review

The Student Record Review was completed by reviewing each student's EC file. The *Special Education Student Record Review Protocol* measures paperwork compliance in the areas of: Informed Consent for the Provision of Services; Prior Written Notice; Initial Evaluation/Reevaluation; Eligibility; IEP Development and Implementation; and Secondary Transition.

[insert table from spreadsheet]

**Corrective Action Required:** \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

## Interviews

Interviews regarding EC Process were conducted with LEA administrators, including EC Directors/Coordinators; EC teachers and related services providers at the selected school sites. Responses were scored on average for each group and across schools using the *Interview Rubric*. Items measured the working knowledge of Child Find, Discipline, Transfer Students, and Secondary Transition.

**Recommendations Offered:** \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

## Service Verification

In order to verify that services were provided in accordance with the IEP, the following components were reviewed: one identified service from each student's IEP, the EC Teacher's schedule and classroom observations by a monitoring team member. Service delivery was considered "Compliant" if services were delivered by appropriately licensed EC staff and as specified on the IEP with a clear relationship to the IEP goals. If the service verification was determined to be "Non-Compliant", the reason will be noted in the comment section of the chart below.

Unique ID	Service	Location	Comments	Compliant (y/n)
	Reading 4xW :30min	SE	Observed	yes

**Corrective Action Required:** \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

**Recommendations Offered:** \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

### Related Services Verification

Related service logs were reviewed for the last completed grading period prior to the on-site visit. Service logs were compared to the corresponding IEPs of the students on the related service provider's caseload to determine if the services were provided in accordance with the service delivery plan articulated on the student's IEP.

Unique ID	Related Service	Location	Comments	Compliant (y/n)
	OT 4xRP :30min	TSE	Verified	yes

**Corrective Action Required:** \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

**Recommendations Offered:** \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

### LEA Resources

This portion of the tool reviews the information the LEA makes available to parents and students regarding resources in the following areas: Child Find, Discipline, Transfer/Incoming New Students and local Dispute Resolution. Recommendations for this area (if any) will be noted in the summary of this report.

*Essential Question:* What mechanisms are used to provide information regarding the EC process, procedures and LEA contact information?



LEA Resources	Website	Handbook	Other	Missing Elements
Child Find Process				
Discipline Procedures				
Transfer Students				
Dispute Resolution				

**Recommendations Offered:** \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

## Licensure

Licensure was reviewed in the context of the names of the EC staff, licensure codes, expiration date and composition of instructional assignment for the school sites identified in the Student Monitoring Sample and according to the service provider observed during the Student Service Verification/Related Services Verification. This information was gathered through the use of a template provided to the EC Director/Coordinator upon notification of the visit and the selected sites. The EC Director/Coordinator also provided a determination as to whether the licensure was compliant which was then verified by the DPI Monitoring Consultant.

School Name					
EC Service Provider Name	Licensure Code(s)	Expiration Date	Class Composition	Teacher licensure area matches at least one student area of eligibility (Yes/No)	Verified (Yes/No)
Ed Teacher	08667	5/16/15	AU, SLD, OHI	Yes	

**Corrective Action Required:** \_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No

## Summary

Commendations

Recommendations

It is highly recommended that the LEA utilize the data in this report in conjunction with the LEA Self-Assessment: Practice Profile to inform system-wide school improvement planning.

Procedural Violations

Compliance Status

### Corrective Action Timelines

Area	Required Action	Evidence of Correction	Due Date
Student Record Review			
Student Service Verification			
Related Service Verification			
Licensure			

All Corrective Action must be completed by **[insert one year due date]**. This includes Prong 2 activities. Successful completion of all Corrective Action within a year of notification results in compliant reporting for the LEA Determination on Indicator 15: Timely Correction.

Evidence of Correction must be submitted, upon completion, to:

[Monitor's Name], Monitoring Consultant  
[Mailing address]  
[Email address]  
[Phone number]

## Resources